arXiv:1609.08016v1 [quant-ph] 26 Sep 2016

Entanglement monotones and transformations of symmetric bipartite states

Mark W. Girard[1, 2, *] and Gilad Gour[1, 2]

[1] *Department of Mathematics and Statistics, University of Calgary*
[2] *Institute for Quantum Science and Technology, University of Calgary*
2500 University Dr NW, Calgary, AB T2N 1N4, Canada

(Dated: September 27, 2016)

The primary goal in the study of entanglement as a resource theory is to find conditions that determine when one quantum state can or cannot be transformed into another via LOCC operations. This is typically done through entanglement monotones or conversion witnesses. Such quantities cannot be computed for arbitrary quantum states in general, but it is useful to consider classes of symmetric states for which closed-form expressions can be found. In this paper, we show how to compute the convex roof of any entanglement monotone for all Werner states. The convex roofs of the well-known Vidal monotones are computed for all isotropic states, and we show how this method can generalize to other entanglement measures and other types of symmetries as well. We also present necessary and sufficient conditions that determine when a pure bipartite state can be deterministically converted into a Werner or isotropic state.

I. INTRODUCTION

One of the main goals in quantum information theory has been to develop the theory of entanglement as a resource [1–5]. The resource theory of entanglement arises naturally from the 'distant labs' setting [6], in which the class of operations that can be performed is known as LOCC (local operations and classical communication). This is the class of local operations that can be implemented by separated parties acting locally upon their particles in a quantum manner, while coordinating their actions with the use of classical communication.

The resourcefulness of entanglement is well-known, and many famous quantum information processing tasks explicitly require the consumption of entanglement. Yet a complete understanding of the allowable transformations among arbitrary mixed states remains unknown. As in any quantum resource theory, given any two states ρ and σ, the principle question that we would like to answer is the following: Is it possible to convert ρ into σ under this restricted class of operations? Although the problem of convertibility for bipartite pure states has been solved [7], a general framework for answering the question of convertibility when mixed states are involved remains elusive.

One way to test whether a transformation from ρ to σ is possible via LOCC is to evaluate some set of entanglement monotones on ρ and σ. Here, we shall consider an entanglement monotone to be any function of pure states that does not increase under deterministic LOCC operations [4, 5, 8]. If ρ is less entangled than σ, i.e. $E(\rho) < E(\sigma)$, with respect to some entanglement monotone E, then ρ cannot be converted into σ via LOCC operations.

The structure of bipartite entanglement is well-known for pure states. Entanglement monotones on pure states must be Schur-concave functions [7] of the Schmidt vectors $E(\psi) = E(\boldsymbol{\lambda})$, where $\boldsymbol{\lambda}$ is the vector of the Schmidt coefficients of $|\psi\rangle$. Without loss of generality, we may write all bipartite pure states in Schmidt form as $|\psi\rangle = \sum_i \sqrt{\lambda_i}|ii\rangle$. Some well-known entanglement monotones include the entropy of entanglement $E(\psi) = H(\boldsymbol{\lambda})$ (where $H(\boldsymbol{\lambda}) = -\sum_i \lambda_i \log \lambda_i$ is the Shannon entropy) and the Renyi α-entropies of entanglement $E_\alpha(\psi) = H_\alpha(\boldsymbol{\lambda})$ (where $H_\alpha(\boldsymbol{\lambda}) = \frac{1}{1-\alpha}\log\left(\sum_i \lambda_i^\alpha\right)$ is the Renyi α-entropy of a probability distribution for $\alpha > 0$ and $\alpha \neq 1$).

Another class of important monotones for bipartite pure states was introduced by Vidal [9] and is defined as follows. Assuming $|\psi\rangle \in \mathbb{C}^d \otimes \mathbb{C}^d$ with $d \geq 2$, for each $k \in \{1, \ldots, d-1\}$ we can define the monotones

$$E_k(\psi) = 1 - \sum_{i=1}^{k} \lambda_i = \sum_{i=k+1}^{d} \lambda_i, \tag{1}$$

where the Schmidt coefficients of $|\psi\rangle$ are in decreasing order $\lambda_1 \geq \cdots \geq \lambda_d$. For each k, $E_k(\psi)$ is the sum of the $d-k$ smallest Schmidt coefficients of $|\psi\rangle$.

Any entanglement monotone for pure states can be extended to arbitrary mixed states by a convex roof construction [10, 11]. Given an entanglement monotone E on pure states, its convex roof on mixed states is defined as

$$\widehat{E}(\rho) = \inf_{\{p_i, |\psi_i\rangle\}} \sum_i p_i E(\psi_i),$$

where the infimum is taken over all pure state decompositions of $\rho = \sum_i p_i |\psi_i\rangle\langle\psi_i|$. While there are many known entanglement monotones for bipartite pure states, evaluating the entanglement of arbitrary mixed states is in general not possible. In this paper, we show how to compute convex roof entanglement monotones on certain classes of entangled states.

Symmetry plays a very important role in many quantum information tasks. Restricting our attention to

* mwgirard (at) ucalgary.ca

highly symmetric states not only simplifies many computations, but yields valuable information about the structure of bipartite entanglement. There is strong evidence that certain symmetric states may provide an example of bound entangled states that have negative partial transposes [12]. We can restrict our attention only to states that are symmetric in some manner, for example the well-known Werner and isotropic states, and exploit that symmetry to compute the convex roof of certain entanglement monotones on those families of states. For example, the entanglement of formation has been computed for Werner states [13] and isotropic states [14]. Convex roofs of some generalizations of the concurrence [15] have been computed for isotropic states as well [16, 17].

In this work, we expand on existing methods [13, 14] to compute the convex roofs of many more entanglement monotones for these classes of symmetric states and more. In particular, we show that our method can be used to compute the convex roof on Werner states for *all* possible entanglement monotones on pure states. We also show how to compute the convex roof of the Vidal monotones in (1) and certain other entanglement monotones for isotropic states. We also show how to extend these methods to compute the convex roof on larger classes of symmetric states.

While only a finite number of entanglement monotones (i.e. the Vidal monotones) are needed to determine convertibility of bipartite pure states, it is known that an infinite number of entanglement monotones are needed to completely determine convertibility of mixed states [18]. To characterize convertibility of mixed states, we can instead make use of entanglement *conversion witnesses* [8, 19]. An entanglement conversion witness is a function of two bipartite quantum states whose value 'detects' when one state can be converted into another. For example, a *no-go* entanglement conversion witness is a function $W(\rho,\sigma)$ such that $W(\rho,\sigma)<0$ implies that ρ cannot be converted to σ with a deterministic LOCC operation. Similarly, a *go* entanglement conversion witness is a function $W(\rho,\sigma)$ such that $W(\rho,\sigma)\geq 0$ implies the existence of a deterministic LOCC protocol that converts ρ into σ. A witness is *complete* if it is both a go and a no-go witness.

In [20], it was shown that a bipartite pure state $|\psi\rangle$ can be converted into a bipartite mixed state ρ if and only if

$$E_k(\psi)\geq\sum_i p_i E_k(\varphi_i)$$

holds for all k and all decompositions $\rho=\sum_i p_i|\varphi_i\rangle\langle\varphi_i|$. This necessary and sufficient condition for LOCC transformation can be encoded into the following complete witness:

$$W(\psi,\rho)=\max_{\{p_i,\varphi_i\}}\min_k\left(E_k(\psi)-\sum_i p_i E_k(\varphi_i)\right).$$

It holds that $W(\psi,\rho)\geq 0$ if and only if $|\psi\rangle$ can be converted into ρ via LOCC. Although this function cannot be computed for arbitrary mixed states, we can make extensive use of symmetry to compute it in the case when ρ is highly symmetric (e.g. Werner or isotropic). In the final section of this paper, we show how to compute a class of entanglement transformation witnesses for pure to mixed bipartite state conversion in the case when the target mixed state is symmetric.

The remainder of this paper is structured as follows. The necessary background for constructing convex roof functions, the definition of the Werner and isotropic states, and other preliminary matter is presented in section II. Convex roofs of certain entanglement monotones are evaluated on Werner and isotropic states in section III. An entanglement transformation witness for pure to mixed state conversion is presented in section IV, where it is also shown how to evaluate this witness when the target state is Werner or isotropic.

II. PRELIMINARIES

In this section, we review the notion of a convex roof of an arbitrary function. The details from [13] that are necessary for computing the convex roofs of functions under generalized symmetry are summarized. We also review the types of bipartite symmetries that we will analyze, in particular the Werner and isotropic states and generalizations of these symmetries.

A. Convex roofs and symmetry

In the following, we use the notation $\overline{\mathbb{R}}=\mathbb{R}\cup\{+\infty\}$. Let K be a compact set, $M\subset K$, and let $f\colon M\to\mathbb{R}$. The *convex roof* of f over K is the function $\widehat{f}:K\to\overline{\mathbb{R}}$ defined as

$$\widehat{f}(x)=\inf\left\{\sum_i p_i f(y_i)\,\middle|\, y_i\in M,\ \sum_i p_i y_i=x\right\},\qquad(2)$$

for any $x\in\mathrm{co}(M)$ in the convex hull of M. The infimum in (2) is taken over all convex combinations with $p_i\geq 0$ and $\sum_i p_i=1$. Note that $\widehat{f}(x)=\infty$ if $x\notin\mathrm{co}(M)$.

Let $\mathcal{G}$ be a compact group with a $\mathcal{G}$-action $g\cdot x$ on K that preserves convex combinations. The *$\mathcal{G}$-twirling* operator $\mathcal{T}_{\mathcal{G}}:K\to K$ is defined as

$$\mathcal{T}_{\mathcal{G}}(x)=\int_{\mathcal{G}}dg\, g\cdot x,\qquad(3)$$

for all $x\in K$, where the integral is taken over the Haar measure of the group. If $\mathcal{T}_{\mathcal{G}}(y)=x$ then we say that y *twirls* to x under $\mathcal{G}$. The $\mathcal{G}$-invariant elements $x\in K$ are exactly those that satisfy $\mathcal{T}_{\mathcal{G}}(x)=x$, and the subset of $\mathcal{G}$-invariant elements of K will be denoted as $\mathcal{T}_{\mathcal{G}}(K)$.

Given any function $f\colon M\to\mathbb{R}$ on a subset $M\subset K$, we define the function $f_{\mathcal{G}}\colon\mathcal{T}_{\mathcal{G}}(K)\to\overline{\mathbb{R}}$ as

$$f_{\mathcal{G}}(x)=\inf\{f(y)\,|\,y\in M,\,\mathcal{T}_{\mathcal{G}}(y)=x\}\qquad(4)$$

for all $x \in \mathcal{T}_{\mathcal{G}}(K)$. As the following theorem shows, this definition allows us to find a different expression for the convex roof of a function $f\colon M \to \overline{\mathbb{R}}$ evaluated on $\mathcal{G}$-invariant elements of K. This is the primary tool that we will use to compute convex roof entanglement monotones on the Werner and isotropic states.

Theorem 1 (Sec. IV.A in [13]). *Let $\mathcal{G}$ be a compact group and K be a compact convex set with a $\mathcal{G}$-action that preserves convex combinations, and let $f\colon M \to \overline{\mathbb{R}}$ be a function on a subset $M \subset K$. It holds that*

$$\widehat{f}(x) = \widehat{f_{\mathcal{G}}}(x) \tag{5}$$

for all $x \in \mathcal{T}_{\mathcal{G}}(K)$.

To compute the convex roof $\widehat{f}$ of a function f on the $\mathcal{G}$-invariant elements of K, the result of Theorem 1 implies that we can simplify the computation by first minimizing f over all $y \in M$ that twirl to x. Computing the convex roof of the resulting function yields the desired result. This computation is simplified greatly if $f_{\mathcal{G}}$ is already convex as a function of $\mathcal{G}$-invariant elements, in which case $\widehat{f}(x)$ reduces to $f_{\mathcal{G}}(x)$. Note that both $f_{\mathcal{G}}$ and $\widehat{f_{\mathcal{G}}}$ are functions on the convex subset $\mathcal{T}_{\mathcal{G}}(K) \subset K$ of elements that are invariant under the action of $\mathcal{G}$.

One basic feature of convex roof functions is the existence of 'linear sections' in the roof function whenever the infimum in (2) is found at a non-trivial convex combination. The result of Lemma 2 (which is proven in [13]) allows us to compute convex roof functions on some elements that are not necessarily symmetric with respect to the group action.

Lemma 2. *Suppose $x = \sum_i p_i x_i \in K$ is a convex combination of elements $x_i \in M$ with $p_i > 0$ for each i such that $\widehat{f}(x) = \sum_i p_i f(x_i)$ is minimized. Then $\widehat{f}$ is linear on the convex hull of $\{x_i\}$. That is, it holds that*

$$\widehat{f}\Big(\sum_i t_i x_i\Big) = \sum_i t_i f(x_i) \tag{6}$$

for all $t_i \in [0,1]$ satisfying $\sum_i t_i = 1$.

In our analysis here, we compute the convex roof of entanglement monotones on pure states for Werner and isotropic states. The minimizing sets will usually be an entire orbit of some pure state under the local-unitary group action. Every pure state in these orbits has the same amount of entanglement under any entanglement monotone, since they differ only by a local unitary. Hence the convex roof of any entanglement monotone will be constant on the convex hull of these orbits. This gives a fairly large class of non-symmetric states for which we can compute the exact value of many different entanglement monotones.

B. Bipartite entanglement symmetry

In this following section, we recall some well-known examples of groups that are used in the study of bipartite quantum entanglement. Let $d \geq 2$ be an integer and consider bipartite states on $\mathbb{C}^d \otimes \mathbb{C}^d$. The convex set of interest here is the set of normalized density operators $\mathrm{D}(\mathbb{C}^d \otimes \mathbb{C}^d) = \{\rho \,|\, \rho \geq 0, \operatorname{Tr}\rho = 1\}$. We are interested in computing the convex roof of entanglement monotones that are defined on the pure states

$$\big\{|\psi\rangle\langle\psi| \,\big|\, |\psi\rangle \in \mathbb{C}^d \otimes \mathbb{C}^d,\ \||\psi\rangle\| = 1\big\} \subset \mathrm{D}(\mathbb{C}^d \otimes \mathbb{C}^d).$$

It is well known that any entanglement monotone on pure states must be a Schur-concave function of the Schmidt coefficients of the pure states. The primary examples of symmetric states that we will study in this paper are the well-known Werner states [21] and isotropic states [22].

For the remainder of this paper we assume that $d \geq 2$ and we only consider bipartite states on $\mathbb{C}^d \otimes \mathbb{C}^d$. We consider classes of states that are symmetric with respect to different subgroups of the group of local unitaries

$$\mathrm{LU} = \{U \otimes V \,|\, U, V \in \mathrm{U}(d)\}.$$

Given a subgroup $\mathcal{G} \subset \mathrm{LU}$, determining which states are invariant under $\mathcal{G}$ amounts to computing the commutant of $\mathcal{G}$,

$$\mathcal{G}' = \{A \in \mathrm{L}(\mathbb{C}^d \otimes \mathbb{C}^d) \,|\, [A, g] = 0 \text{ for all } g \in \mathcal{G}\}.$$

This is the subspace of operators that commute with every element of $\mathcal{G}$. The twirling operator $\mathcal{T}_{\mathcal{G}}$ can be viewed as the projection operator onto the commutant of $\mathcal{G}$. Furthermore, note that for any $\mathcal{G} \subseteq \mathrm{LU}$ the twirling operation $\mathcal{T}_{\mathcal{G}}$ is an LOCC operation, since it consists of a convex mixture of local unitary channels.

1. *Werner states*

The $d \times d$ *Werner states* [21] are those that commute with all unitaries of the form $U \otimes U$ for some $U \in \mathrm{U}(d)$. That is, Werner states are those which are invariant under the subgroup $\{U \otimes U \,|\, U \in \mathrm{U}(d)\}$. The corresponding twirling operator is

$$\mathcal{T}_{\mathrm{wer}}(\rho) = \int_{\mathrm{U}(d)} dU\, U \otimes U \rho U^* \otimes U^*,$$

where the integral is taken over the Haar measure of the group $\mathrm{U}(d)$ of $d \times d$ unitary matrices. The commutant of this group is spanned by $\{\mathbb{1}, W\}$, where $\mathbb{1}$ is the identity operator and W is the swap operator defined by $W = \sum_{i,j=1}^{d} |ij\rangle\langle ji|$. The swap operator is both unitary and Hermitian, having eigenvalues 1 and -1 and satisfying $W^2 = \mathbb{1}$. Let W_+ and W_- denote the projectors onto the subspaces spanned by the positive and negative eigenvectors of W, respectively, such that $W = W_+ - W_-$. The Werner states can then be parameterized by

$$\rho_{\mathrm{wer}}(a) = a\tfrac{1}{\binom{d}{2}} W_- + (1-a)\tfrac{1}{\binom{d+1}{2}} W_+ \tag{7}$$

for $a \in [0,1]$. These states are entangled for $a \in [\frac{1}{2}, 1]$ and separable otherwise [13, 23]. Furthermore, it holds that $\mathcal{T}_{\mathrm{wer}}(\sigma) = \rho_{\mathrm{wer}}(\operatorname{Tr}[\sigma W_-])$ holds for all states σ.

2. Isotropic states

The $d \times d$ *isotropic states* [22] are those invariant under the subgroup $\{U \otimes \overline{U} \,|\, U \in \mathrm{U}(d)\}$. The corresponding twirling operator is

$$\mathcal{T}_{\mathrm{iso}}(\rho) = \int_{\mathrm{U}(d)} dU\, U \otimes \overline{U} \rho U^* \otimes \overline{U}^*.$$

The commutant of this group is spanned by $\{\mathbb{1}, \Phi_d\}$, where $\Phi_d = \frac{1}{d}\sum_{i,j=1}^{d} |ii\rangle\langle jj|$ is the projection operator onto the maximally entangled pure state $\frac{1}{\sqrt{d}}\sum_{i=1}^{d}|ii\rangle$ of two qudits. The isotropic states can be parameterized by

$$\rho_{\mathrm{iso}}(b) = b\Phi_d + (1-b)\frac{\mathbb{1} - \Phi_d}{d^2 - 1} \tag{8}$$

for $b \in [0,1]$. The isotropic states are entangled for $b \in [\frac{1}{d}, 1]$ and separable otherwise [13, 23]. Furthermore, it holds that $\mathcal{T}_{\mathrm{iso}}(\sigma) = \rho_{\mathrm{iso}}(\mathrm{Tr}[\sigma\Phi_d])$ holds for all states σ.

3. OO-invariant states

One way to generalize the isotropic and Werner states to larger classes of symmetric states is to consider the *OO*-invariant states [13]. These are the states that are invariant under $\{U \otimes U \,|\, U \in \mathrm{O}(d)\}$, where $\mathrm{O}(d) \subset \mathrm{U}(d)$ is the group of orthogonal operators. Since the orthogonal matrices are the unitaries that satisfy $\overline{U} = U$, this group is a subgroup of both the isotropic and Werner group of local unitaries. The corresponding *OO*-twirling operator is defined as

$$\mathcal{T}_{\mathrm{OO}}(\rho) = \int_{\mathrm{O}(d)} dU\, U \otimes U \rho U^* \otimes U^*.$$

The commutant of this group is spanned by $\{\mathbb{1}, W, \Phi_d\}$. The *OO*-invariant states can be parameterized as

$$\rho_{\mathrm{O}}(a,b) = a\tfrac{1}{\binom{d}{2}}W_- + b\Phi_d + (1-a-b)\tfrac{1}{\binom{d+1}{2}-1}(\mathbb{1} - \Phi_d - W_-) \tag{9}$$

for $a, b \in [0,1]$ satisfying $a + b \leq 1$. The *OO*-invariant states that are separable (and also positive under partial transposition) [13] are those in the rectangle $(a,b) \in [0, \frac{1}{2}] \times [0, \frac{1}{d}]$. The Werner states are *OO*-invariant states for which $b = \frac{2(1-a)}{d(d+1)}$ and the isotropic states are those for which $b = 1 - \frac{2(d+1)}{d}a$. A schematic of the *OO*-invariant states is shown in Fig 1.

The entanglement of formation and asymptotic relative entropy of entanglement of *OO*-invariant states have been computed [13, 24]. In section III, we should how to compute almost any convex roof monotone on the *OO*-invariant states.

4. Phase-permutation-invariant states

Other subgroups of $\mathrm{U}(d)$ lead to further generalizations of the Werner and isotropic states. One possible subgroup that leads to two-parameter families of symmetric states is the following. Consider the subgroup of 'phase-permutation' unitary matrices defined by

$$G = \{P_\pi U \,|\, \pi \in \mathcal{S}_d,\, U \in \mathrm{U}(d) \text{ is diagonal}\}, \tag{10}$$

where $\mathcal{S}_d$ is the symmetric group and $P_\pi = \sum_{i=1}^{d} |\pi(i)\rangle\langle i|$ is the permutation matrix for $\pi \in \mathcal{S}_d$. If we denote the group of diagonal unitary matrices by $N \simeq \mathrm{U}(1)^{\times d}$, we see that N is a normal subgroup of G. The group G of phase-permutation unitaries can be viewed as the semi-direct product $G = N \rtimes \mathcal{P}_d$, where $\mathcal{P}_d = \{P_\pi \,|\, \pi \in \mathcal{S}_d\}$ denotes the group of $d \times d$ permutation matrices. This is also the subgroup of unitaries that have exactly one nonzero entry in each row and column.



FIG. 1. Schematic of the *OO*-invariant states $\rho_{\mathrm{O}}(a,b)$, as defined in (9). The shaded region represents the separable (and PPT) states. The one-dimensional subfamilies of Werner and isotropic states are also shown. Convex roof entanglement monotones can be computed for states in regions A and B, as discussed in Section III D. It remains unknown how to compute convex roofs on states in region C for an arbitrary entanglement monotone.

a. Phase-permutation Werner states Consider the family of Werner-type states that are invariant under $\{U \otimes U \,|\, U \in G\}$, where G is the group of phase-permutation matrices defined in (10). Such states will be referred to in this paper as *phase-permutation Werner states*. This class of states was first introduced in [12] and used in [25]. The corresponding twirling operation is

$$\mathcal{T}^G_{\mathrm{wer}}(\rho) = \int_G dU\, U \otimes U \rho U^* \otimes U^*.$$

The commutant of this group is spanned by $\{\mathbb{1}, W, Q\}$, where Q is the projection operator defined by

$$Q = \sum_{i=1}^{d} |ii\rangle\langle ii| \tag{11}$$



FIG. 2. Schematic of the phase-permutation Werner states. The separable (PPT) region is shown in gray. The one-dimensional family of states with $b = \frac{d-1}{d+1}(1-a)$ are the well-known Werner states. As shown in Sec. III D, the convex roof of any entanglement monotone can be computed for any state in region A. It remains unknown how to compute convex roofs on states in region B for an arbitrary entanglement monotone.



FIG. 3. Schematic of the phase-permutation isotropic states. The separable (PPT) region is shown in gray. The one-dimensional family of states with $b = 1-(d+1)a$ are the isotropic states. As shown in Sec. III C, the convex roof of any entanglement monotone can be computed for any state in region B. It remains unknown how to compute convex roofs on states in region A for an arbitrary entanglement monotone.

and satisfies $[Q, W_\pm] = 0$, $QW_- = 0$, and $QW_+ = Q$. This family of states can be parameterized by

$$\rho^G_{\text{wer}}(a,b) = a\frac{1}{\binom{d}{2}}W_- + b\frac{1}{\binom{d}{2}}(W_+ - Q) + (1-a-b)\frac{1}{d}Q \quad (12)$$

for $a, b \in [0,1]$ satisfying $a + b \leq 1$. For all states ρ, it holds that $\mathcal{T}^G_{\text{wer}}(\rho) = \rho^G_{\text{wer}}(a,b)$, where $a = \text{Tr}[\rho W_-]$ and $b = \text{Tr}[\rho(W_+ - Q)]$. The Werner states form a subfamily of this class. A schematic of the phase-permutation Werner states is depicted in Fig 2.

b. Phase-permutation isotropic states Similarly, we can consider the family of isotropic-type states that are invariant under $\{U \otimes \overline{U} \,|\, U \in G\}$. We refer to these as the *phase-permutation isotropic states*. These states have been studied by others [16, 17, 26] where they have been called the *axisymmetric states*. The corresponding twirling operation is

$$\mathcal{T}^G_{\text{iso}}(\rho) = \int_G dU\, U \otimes \overline{U}\rho U^* \otimes \overline{U}^*.$$

The commutant of this group is spanned by $\{\mathbb{1}, \Phi_d, Q\}$. The family of phase-permutation isotropic states can be parameterized as

$$\rho^G_{\text{iso}}(a,b) = b\Phi_d + a\tfrac{1}{d-1}(Q - \Phi_d) + (1-a-b)\tfrac{1}{d(d-1)}(\mathbb{1} - Q) \quad (13)$$

for $a, b \in [0,1]$ satisfying $a + b \leq 1$. For all states ρ, it holds that $\mathcal{T}^G_{\text{iso}}(\rho) = \rho^G_{\text{iso}}(a,b)$ where $b = \text{Tr}[\rho\Phi_d]$ and $a = \text{Tr}[\rho(Q - \Phi_d)]$. The isotropic states form a subfamily of this class. A schematic of the phase-permutation isotropic states is depicted in Fig 3.

III. CONVEX ROOF ENTANGLEMENT MONOTONES FOR SYMMETRIC STATES

In this section, we compute the convex roof of arbitrary entanglement monotones evaluated on the Werner and isotropic states. For Werner states, we compute this for any monotone. For isotropic states, we compute the convex roofs of the Vidal monotones and generalize the computation to certain classes of other monotones.

A. Werner states

In this subsection we present a general method for computing convex roofs of entanglement monotones evaluated on the Werner states of a $d \times d$ bipartite system. For any $a \in [0,1]$, consider the minimum entanglement of all pure states that twirl to $\rho_{\text{wer}}(a)$ under this action as in (4). Given an arbitrary entanglement monotone E on pure states, define the function $E_{\text{wer}} \colon [0,1] \to \mathbb{R}$ as

$$E_{\text{wer}}(a) = \min\{E(\psi) \,|\, \langle\psi|W_-|\psi\rangle = a\}. \quad (14)$$

If we can evaluate (14) for a given entanglement monotone E, then we may make use of Theorem 1 to compute the convex roof of E on Werner states by computing $\widehat{E_{\text{wer}}}$. This result is greatly simplified if E_{wer} is already convex as a function of a.

Theorem 3. *Let E be an entanglement monotone on pure states. For all $a \in [0,1]$, it holds that*

$$E_{\mathrm{wer}}(a) = E(\psi_a), \tag{15}$$

where E_{wer} is the function as defined in (14), and $|\psi_a\rangle$ are the pure states defined by

$$|\psi_a\rangle = \left(\sqrt{1-2a}\,|1\rangle + \sqrt{2a}\,|2\rangle\right) \otimes |2\rangle \tag{16}$$

whenever $a \in [0, \frac{1}{2}]$, and

$$|\psi_a\rangle = \sqrt{\tfrac{1}{2} + \sqrt{a(1-a)}}\,|12\rangle - \sqrt{\tfrac{1}{2} - \sqrt{a(1-a)}}\,|21\rangle \tag{17}$$

whenever $a \in [\frac{1}{2}, 1]$.

Note that the pure states $|\psi_a\rangle$ twirl to the Werner state $\rho_{\mathrm{wer}}(a)$. Indeed, a straightforward calculation shows that $\langle\psi_a|W_-|\psi_a\rangle = a$ for all a. In particular, this Theorem states that the pure states $|\psi_a\rangle$ are in fact optimal in the computation in (14) for *every* possible entanglement monotone. This is a generalization of the statement in [13, Sec. IV.C], where the convex roof of the entanglement of formation was computed for Werner states. The proof of Theorem 3, which can be found in Appendix A, is quite technical and follows the method used in [13].

From Theorems 1 and 3, it follows that $\widehat{E}(\rho_{\mathrm{wer}}(a)) = \widehat{E_{\mathrm{wer}}}(a)$. This computation is greatly simplified if E_{wer} is already convex as a function of a (as it is for the entanglement of formation), otherwise there are simple procedures for computing the convex roof of a function of a single variable. Even if the convex roof of E_{wer} as a function of a cannot be computed for a particular entanglement monotone E, the formula in (15) still gives an upper bound for $\widehat{E}$ on Werner states since $\widehat{E}(\rho_{\mathrm{wer}}(a)) = \widehat{E_{\mathrm{wer}}}(a) \geq E_{\mathrm{wer}}(a)$ always holds.

1. Entanglement of formation

The entanglement of formation [27] is one well-known convex roof entanglement monotone. This is defined as $E_F(\rho) = \widehat{E}(\rho)$ for mixed states ρ, where E is the entropy of entanglement on pure states $E(\psi) = H(\boldsymbol{\lambda})$, H is the Shannon entropy, and $\boldsymbol{\lambda}$ is the vector of Schmidt coefficients of $|\psi\rangle$. When $a \in [\frac{1}{2}, 1]$, the entropy of entanglement of $|\psi_a\rangle$ is given by

$$E(\psi_a) = h\big(\tfrac{1}{2} - \sqrt{a(1-a)}\big), \tag{18}$$

where $h(t) = -t\log t - (1-t)\log(1-t)$ is the binary entropy function. Note that the function in (18) is convex as a function of a, so it follows that

$$E_F(\rho_{\mathrm{wer}}(a)) = \begin{cases} 0, & a \in [0, \frac{1}{2}] \\ h\big(\frac{1}{2} - \sqrt{a(1-a)}\big), & a \in [\frac{1}{2}, 1]. \end{cases} \tag{19}$$

This matches the result found in [13].

2. Vidal monotones

Consider now the Vidal monotones E_k on pure states. Evaluating the convex roof of these monotones on the Werner states can be done easily, because $E_{k,\mathrm{wer}}(a)$ is already convex as a function of a.

Theorem 4. *Consider the convex roof of the Vidal monotones E_k on Werner states. The first Vidal monotone reduces to*

$$\widehat{E_1}(\rho_{\mathrm{wer}}(a)) = \begin{cases} 0, & a \in [0, \frac{1}{2}] \\ \frac{1}{2} - \sqrt{a(1-a)}, & a \in [\frac{1}{2}, 1]. \end{cases} \tag{20}$$

For $k > 1$, $\widehat{E_k}(\rho_{\mathrm{wer}}(a)) = 0$ for all a.

In particular, the convex roof of the k^{th} Vidal monotone vanishes for all Werner states when $k \neq 1$. Indeed, it holds that $E_k(\psi_a) = 0$ for all a if $k > 1$, since the Schmidt vector of $|\psi_a\rangle$ has at most two nonzero components. For $a \in [\frac{1}{2}, 1]$, note that

$$E_1(\psi_a) = \frac{1}{2} - \sqrt{a(1-a)},$$

which is already convex as a function of a.

3. Renyi entropies

The result of Theorem 3 can also be used to compute the convex roofs of Renyi entropies [28] of entanglement evaluated on Werner states. For $\alpha > 0$ with $\alpha \neq 1$, the Renyi-α entropy of entanglement is defined as $E_\alpha(\boldsymbol{\lambda}) = \frac{1}{1-\alpha}\log\big(\sum_i \lambda_i^\alpha\big)$ for pure states with Schmidt vector $\boldsymbol{\lambda}$. These are in fact Schur-concave functions of $\boldsymbol{\lambda}$ and are thus valid entanglement monotones on pure states. The form of (14) for these monotones reduces to

$$E_{\alpha,\mathrm{wer}}(a) = \frac{1}{1-\alpha}\log\left(\left(\tfrac{1}{2} + \sqrt{a(1-a)}\right)^\alpha + \left(\tfrac{1}{2} - \sqrt{a(1-a)}\right)^\alpha\right). \tag{21}$$

Numerical evidence suggests that (21) is strictly convex whenever $\alpha > 1$, and that (21) is strictly concave on the interval $a \in [\frac{1}{2}, 1]$ whenever $\alpha < \frac{1}{2}$. Thus $\widehat{E_\alpha}(\rho_{\mathrm{wer}}(a)) = E_{\alpha,\mathrm{wer}}(a)$ for $\alpha > 1$ and $\widehat{E_\alpha}(\rho_{\mathrm{wer}}(a)) = \max\{0, (2a-1)\log 2\}$ for $\alpha < \frac{1}{2}$.

B. Isotropic states

In this section we present a general method for computing convex roofs of entanglement monotones evaluated on the isotropic states of a $d \times d$ bipartite system. In particular, we show explicit formulas for the convex roofs of the Vidal monotones, as we did for the Werner states in the previous section. Using majorization, the result for the

Vidal monotones is used to find a simple lower bound for any entanglement monotone on isotropic states. An outline for computing the convex roof of the Renyi entropies on isotropic states is also presented. Detailed proofs can be found in appendix B.

The isotropic states are those that are invariant under the action $U \cdot \rho = U \otimes \overline{U} \rho U^* \otimes \overline{U}^*$ from the d-dimensional unitary matrices. Similar to our analysis of Werner states, for any $b \in [0,1]$, we consider the minimum entanglement of all pure states that twirl to $\rho_{\text{iso}}(b)$ under this action as follows. Given an arbitrary entanglement monotone E on pure states, define the function $E_{\text{iso}} \colon [0,1] \to \mathbb{R}$ by

$$E_{\text{iso}}(b) = \min\big\{E(\psi) \,\big|\, \langle\psi|\Phi_d|\psi\rangle = b\big\}. \tag{22}$$

If we can determine a closed-form expression of (22) for a given entanglement monotone E, we can make use of Theorem 1 to compute the convex roof of E on isotropic states by computing $\widehat{E_{\text{iso}}}$. This result is greatly simplified if E_{iso} is already convex as a function of b. We use the result of the following lemma to simplify computations.

Lemma 5. *Let E be an entanglement monotone on pure states. For all $b \in [\frac{1}{d}, 1]$, it holds that*

$$E_{\text{iso}}(b) = \min\left\{E(\boldsymbol{\lambda}) \,\middle|\, \sum_{i=1}^{d} \sqrt{\lambda_i} = \sqrt{db}\right\}, \tag{23}$$

where the infimum is taken over all Schmidt vectors satisfying the condition. Furthermore, $E_{\text{iso}}(b) = 0$ whenever $b \in [0, \frac{1}{d}]$.

A closed-form expression for E_{iso} in the right-hand side of (23) can actually be computed for specific monotones E, which we show in the remainder of this section. In particular, we compute E_{iso} in the cases when E is a Vidal monotone or an entropy-type monotone. The proof of Lemma 5, which is a generalization of the result in [14], is quite technical and can be found in Appendix B.

1. Vidal monotones

Here we present the results for evaluating the convex roofs of the Vidal monotones (1) on isotropic states. The Schmidt vector that minimizes $E_{k,\text{iso}}$ in (23) will be of the form.

$$\boldsymbol{\lambda} = \big(\underbrace{t, \ldots, t}_{k}, \underbrace{\tfrac{1-kt}{d-k}, \ldots, \tfrac{1-kt}{d-k}}_{d-k}\big) \tag{24}$$

with $t \geq \frac{1-kt}{d-k}$. This allows us to compute the convex roofs of the Vidal monotones on isotropic states.

Theorem 6. *Consider the convex roof of the Vidal monotones E_k on the isotropic states of $\mathbb{C}^d \otimes \mathbb{C}^d$. For $k \in \{1, \ldots, d-1\}$ and $b \in [0,1]$, it holds that*

$$\widehat{E_k}(\rho_{\text{iso}}(b)) = \begin{cases} 0, & b \in [0, \frac{k}{d}] \\ \frac{1}{d}\left(\sqrt{(1-b)k} - \sqrt{b(d-k)}\right)^2, & b \in [\frac{k}{d}, 1]. \end{cases} \tag{25}$$

Proof. Note that $\widehat{E_k}(\rho_{\text{iso}}(b)) = \widehat{E_{k,\text{iso}}}(b)$ by Theorem 1, where $E_{k,\text{iso}}$ is the function as defined in (22) and the entanglement monotone used is $E = E_k$. An explicit form of (22) for the Vidal monotones is computed in (B3) of Theorem 16 in Appendix B. It is clear that $E_{k,\text{iso}}(b)$ in (B3) is convex as a function of b (which may be confirmed by examining its second derivative). Thus $E_{k,\text{iso}} = \widehat{E_{k,\text{iso}}}$, which concludes the proof. □

The convex roofs of the Vidal monotones can be trivially computed for $k \geq d$, in which case $E_{k,\text{iso}}(b) = 0$ for all $k \geq d$ and any b. A plot of the Vidal monotones (25) evaluated on isotropic states $\rho_{\text{iso}}(b)$ with $d = 5$ is shown in Fig 4.



FIG. 4. The convex roof of the Vidal monotones E_1, E_2, E_3, and E_4 evaluated on isotropic states with dimension $d = 5$.

It is perhaps interesting to note that the equation

$$y = \left(\sqrt{(1-x)\tfrac{k}{d}} - \sqrt{(1-\tfrac{k}{d})x}\right)^2$$

is part of the unique ellipse that is tangent to the x-axis at the point $(\frac{k}{d}, 1)$ and tangent to the y-axis at the points $(1, \frac{k}{d})$ and $(0, 1-\frac{k}{d})$.

The resulting computations of computing the Vidal monotones on isotropic states can also be used to construct a lower bound for any arbitrary entanglement monotone evaluated on isotropic states. For any $d \geq 2$ and any $b \in [0,1]$, define the following Schmidt vector:

$$\boldsymbol{\lambda}^b = \begin{pmatrix} 1 - E_{1,\text{iso}}(b) \\ E_{1,\text{iso}}(b) - E_{2,\text{iso}}(b) \\ \vdots \\ E_{d-2,\text{iso}}(b) - E_{d-1,\text{iso}}(b) \\ E_{d-1,\text{iso}}(b) \end{pmatrix}. \tag{26}$$

For each k it holds that $E_k(\boldsymbol{\lambda}^b) = E_{k,\mathrm{iso}}(b)$. By construction, it holds that $E_k(\psi) \geq E_k(\boldsymbol{\lambda}^b)$ for any pure state $|\psi\rangle$ that twirls to $\rho_{\mathrm{iso}}(b)$ (i.e. satisfying $\langle\psi|\Phi_d|\psi\rangle = b$). Thus $\boldsymbol{\lambda} \prec \boldsymbol{\lambda}^b$ where $\boldsymbol{\lambda}$ is a Schmidt vector of any pure state that twirls to $\rho_{\mathrm{iso}}(b)$. This implies that we can use $\boldsymbol{\lambda}^b$ to construct a lower bound for any entanglement monotone E evaluated on isotropic states. In particular, it holds that

$$\widehat{E}(\rho_{\mathrm{iso}}(b)) \geq E(\boldsymbol{\lambda}^b) \tag{27}$$

for the convex roof of any possible entanglement monotone E evaluated on isotropic states.

2. Generalized entropy measures

It is also possible to study the convex roof of generalized measures of entropy, as studied in [29], rather than entanglement measures. Generalized entropy measures are functions of the form $H_f(\boldsymbol{\lambda}) = \sum_i f(\lambda_i)$ for functions f that satisfy the following conditions:

1. $f(0) = 0$;
2. f is either strictly concave or strictly convex on the interval $[0, 1]$; and
3. the first derivative f' exists and is continuous on the interval $(0, 1)$.

This includes the entropy of entanglement when $f(x) = -x \log x$, as well as quantities that are related to the Renyi entropies when $f(x) = x^\alpha$. In [29] it was shown how to compute the minimum and maximum values of one generalized entropy $H_f(\boldsymbol{\lambda})$ for all Schmidt vectors $\boldsymbol{\lambda}$ with some other generalized entropy $H_g(\boldsymbol{\lambda}) = c$ held constant. It turns out that the Schmidt vectors minimizing or maximizing these quantities will either be of the form

$$\boldsymbol{\lambda} = \left(t, \tfrac{1-t}{d-1}, \ldots, \tfrac{1-t}{d-1}\right) \tag{28}$$

where $t \geq \frac{1-t}{d-1}$, or

$$\boldsymbol{\lambda} = \left(t, \ldots, t, 1-kt, 0, \ldots, 0\right) \tag{29}$$

where $t \geq 1-kt$, and there are $k = \lfloor \frac{1}{t} \rfloor$ probabilities equal to t. We can then make use of the following theorem.

Theorem 7 (Thm. 1 in [29]). *Let $f\colon [0,1] \to \mathbb{R}$ and $g\colon [0,1] \to \mathbb{R}$ both satisfy conditions 1-3 above.*

1. *If $f' \circ (g')^{-1}$ is strictly convex (concave), then the maximum (minimum) H_f that can be achieved for fixed H_g is obtained by a probability distribution of the form in* (28).
2. *If $f' \circ (g')^{-1}$ is strictly concave (convex), then the minimum (maximum) H_f that can be achieved for fixed H_g is obtained by a probability distribution of the form in* (29).

Note that g in Theorem 7 is either strictly concave or convex, so it must hold that g' is in fact invertible on the interval $(0, 1)$.

Given a function f that satisfies the conditions above, we can define an entropy measure on pure states by $S_f(\psi) = H_f(\boldsymbol{\lambda})$, where $\boldsymbol{\lambda}$ here is the vector of Schmidt coefficients of $|\psi\rangle$. This can be extended to mixed states via the convex roof construction. Evaluating the convex roof of such an entropy measure on isotropic states $\rho_{\mathrm{iso}}(b)$ amounts to minimizing $H_f(\boldsymbol{\lambda})$ subject to the constraint $\sum_i \sqrt{\lambda_i} = \sqrt{db}$. In particular we can evaluate functions of the form

$$H_{f,\mathrm{iso}}(b) = \inf\left\{ H_f(\boldsymbol{\lambda}) \;\middle|\; \sum_{i=1}^{d} \sqrt{\lambda_i} = \sqrt{db} \right\} \tag{30}$$

for $b \in [\frac{1}{d}, 1]$. The constraint in (30) can be re-written as $\sqrt{db} = H_g(\boldsymbol{\lambda})$, where we choose $g(x) = \sqrt{x}$. If f satisfies the conditions in Theorem 7, then we may use Theorem 7 to compute the value in (30). Note that $(g')^{-1}(x) = \frac{1}{4x^2}$, so it suffices to check if $f'(\frac{1}{4x^2})$ is either strictly concave or convex as a function of x.

Using $\boldsymbol{\lambda}$ of the form in (28), solving for t with respect to the constraint $\sum_{i=1}^{d} \sqrt{\lambda_i} = \sqrt{db}$ such that $H_f(\boldsymbol{\lambda})$ is minimized yields

$$t = 1 - \frac{1}{d}\left(\sqrt{1-b} - \sqrt{b(d-1)}\right)^2. \tag{31}$$

Therefore, if $f'(\frac{1}{4x^2})$ is strictly concave, it follows that $H_{f,\mathrm{iso}}(b) = f(t) + (d-1)f(\frac{1-t}{d-1})$, where the value of t is taken from (31).

Using $\boldsymbol{\lambda}$ of the form in (29), solving for t with respect to the constraint $\sum_{i=1}^{d} \sqrt{\lambda_i} = \sqrt{db}$ such that $H_f(\boldsymbol{\lambda})$ is minimized yields

$$t = \frac{\left(\sqrt{dbk} + \sqrt{k+1-db}\right)^2}{k(k+1)^2}, \tag{32}$$

where $k = \lfloor db \rfloor$. It follows that, if $f'(\frac{1}{4x^2})$ is strictly convex then $H_{f,\mathrm{iso}}(b) = \lfloor db \rfloor f(t) + f(1 - \lfloor db \rfloor t)$, where the value of t is taken from (32). Example values of t in (31) and (32) as functions of b for $d = 5$ are plotted in Fig 5.

3. Generalized concurrences

Using the methods above, it is also possible to compute convex roofs of some of the *generalized concurrence monotones* [15]. These are defined as follows. For $k = 1, 2, \ldots, d$, let S_k be the k^{th} elementary symmetric polynomial of d variables. That is,

$$S_1(\boldsymbol{\lambda}) = \sum_{i=1}^{d} \lambda_i, \;\; S_2(\boldsymbol{\lambda}) = \sum_{i<j} \lambda_i \lambda_j, \;\; \cdots, \;\; S_d(\boldsymbol{\lambda}) = \prod_{i=1}^{d} \lambda_i.$$



FIG. 5. Example values of t from eqs. (31) (solid line) and (32) (dashed line) as functions of a for $d = 5$.

Note that $S_k(\frac{1}{d},\ldots,\frac{1}{d}) = \frac{1}{d^k}\binom{d}{k}$, and each S_k is a Schur-concave function [30]. The generalized concurrence monotones are defined by

$$C_k(\boldsymbol{\lambda}) = \tfrac{d}{\binom{d}{k}^{1/k}} S_k(\boldsymbol{\lambda})^{1/k}.$$

These are also Schur concave functions and thus are entanglement monotones on pure states. Each C_k achieves a maximum value of 1 on the maximally entangled pure state of two qudits. Note that C_d is sometimes called the G-concurrence [15].

Here, we compute the convex roofs of C_2 and C_d on isotropic states. For $b \in [\frac{1}{d}, 1]$, we minimize C_2 and C_d over all Schmidt vectors that satisfy $\sum_{i=1}^d \lambda_i = 1$ and $\sum_{i=1}^d \sqrt{\lambda_i} = \sqrt{db}$.

We first compute $\widehat{C_2}$ for isotropic states. Note that

$$S_2(\boldsymbol{\lambda}) = \frac{1}{2}\Big(1 - \sum_{i=1}^d \lambda_i^2\Big).$$

Hence, minimizing $S_2(\boldsymbol{\lambda})$ is equivalent to maximizing $\sum_{i=1}^d \lambda_i^2$. By Theorem 7, the optimal value of this will be achieved by the Schmidt vector of the form in (28) with the value t from (31). Thus

$$C_{2,\mathrm{iso}}(b) = \frac{\sqrt{d}}{d-1}\sqrt{(1-t)(d(1+t)-2)}, \qquad (33)$$

with t from (31) and $b \in [\frac{1}{d}, 1]$. The function in (33) is strictly concave as a function of b, thus its convex roof is the linear function

$$\widehat{C_{2,\mathrm{iso}}}(b) = \begin{cases} 0, & 0 \le b \le \frac{1}{d} \\ \frac{db-1}{d-1}, & \frac{1}{d} \le b \le 1. \end{cases} \qquad (34)$$

Hence, the convex roof of the 2-concurrence on isotropic states reduces to $\widehat{C_2}(\rho_{\mathrm{iso}}(b)) = \widehat{C_{2,\mathrm{iso}}}(b)$. This agrees with the result from [16].

To compute the convex hull of the G-concurrence $\widehat{C_d}$ for isotropic states, note that

$$\log S_d(\boldsymbol{\lambda}) = \sum_{i=1}^d \log \lambda_i.$$

Thus minimizing $S_d(\boldsymbol{\lambda})$ is equivalent to maximizing $\sum_{i=1}^d \log \lambda_i$. By Theorem 7, the optimal value will be achieved by the Schmidt vector of the form in (29) with the value t from (32). Thus $C_{d,\mathrm{iso}}(b) = 0$ for $b \le 1 - \frac{1}{d}$, and

$$C_{d,\mathrm{iso}}(b) = d\left(t^{d-1} - (d-1)t^d\right)^{1/d} \qquad (35)$$

for $b > 1 - \frac{1}{d}$ where

$$t = \frac{1}{d(d-1)}\left(\sqrt{(d-1)b} + \sqrt{1-b}\right)^2.$$

The expression in (35) is strictly concave as a function of b, thus its convex roof is just the linear function

$$\widehat{C_{d,\mathrm{iso}}}(b) = \begin{cases} 0, & 0 \le b \le 1 - \frac{d}{d} \\ db - d + 1, & 1 - \frac{1}{d} \le b \le 1. \end{cases} \qquad (36)$$

Hence, the convex roof of the G-concurrence on isotropic states reduces to $\widehat{C_d}(\rho_{\mathrm{iso}}(b)) = \widehat{C_{d,\mathrm{iso}}}(b)$. This agrees with the result from [17].

C. Extension to some non-symmetric states

Here we show how to use the results from the previous sections to compute convex roof entanglement monotones for some states that are not necessarily symmetric.

For a subgroup $\mathcal{G} \subset \mathrm{LU}$ of local unitaries and an entanglement monotone E on pure states, recall that we can define the function

$$E_{\mathcal{G}}(\rho) := \min\{E(\psi) \,|\, \mathcal{T}_{\mathcal{G}}(|\psi\rangle\langle\psi|) = \rho\}$$

on $\mathcal{G}$-invariant states ρ, where the minimization is taken over all pure states. A pure state $|\psi\rangle$ is said to minimizes the entanglement of ρ (with respect to $\mathcal{G}$ and E) if $\mathcal{T}_{\mathcal{G}}(|\psi\rangle\langle\psi|) = \rho$ and $E(\psi) = E_{\mathcal{G}}(\rho)$. We also consider the orbit of $|\psi\rangle$ under the group $\mathcal{G}$, which we denote as

$$\mathrm{orb}_{\mathcal{G}}(\psi) = \{g|\psi\rangle\langle\psi|g^* \,|\, g \in \mathcal{G}\}.$$

Theorem 8. *Let $\mathcal{G} \subset \mathrm{LU}$ is a subgroup of local unitaries, let ρ be a $\mathcal{G}$-invariant state, and let $|\psi\rangle$ be a pure state that minimizes the entanglement of ρ with respect to E as defined in the preceding paragraph. If $\widehat{E_{\mathcal{G}}}(\rho) = E_{\mathcal{G}}(\rho)$, then*

$$\widehat{E}(\sigma) = E(\psi) \quad \text{for all } \sigma \in \mathrm{co}\left(\mathrm{orb}_{\mathcal{G}}(\psi)\right), \qquad (37)$$

where co *denotes the convex hull.*

Proof. Suppose the conditions of the theorem are satisfied and let $\sigma \in \mathrm{co}\left(\mathrm{orb}_{\mathcal{G}}(\psi)\right)$. Since $\mathcal{G}$ is a subgroup of local unitaries, it holds that $E(g|\psi\rangle) = E(\psi)$ for all $g \in \mathcal{G}$. It follows that $\widehat{E}(\sigma) \leq E(\psi)$ from the definition of the convex roof. Furthermore, since $\mathcal{T}_{\mathcal{G}}$ is an LOCC channel, it holds that $\widehat{E}(\mathcal{T}_{\mathcal{G}}(\sigma)) \leq \widehat{E}(\sigma)$. Note that $\rho = \mathcal{T}_{\mathcal{G}}(\sigma)$ and $\widehat{E}(\rho) = \widehat{E_{\mathcal{G}}}(\rho)$. The result follows. □

Theorem 8 allows us to compute the convex hull on a larger class of non-symmetric states if we can find $\mathcal{G}$-invariant states such that $\widehat{E_{\mathcal{G}}}(\rho) = E_{\mathcal{G}}(\rho)$. On the other hand, if $\widehat{E_{\mathcal{G}}}(\rho) < E_{\mathcal{G}}(\rho)$, we can still compute $\widehat{E}$ on a larger class of non-symmetric states under certain conditions. See Appendix C for details.

D. Convex roofs on other symmetries

In [13], it was shown how to extend the convex roof formula for the entanglement of formation E_F from the Werner and isotropic states to a larger family of OO-invariant states. Here, we show that this can in fact be done for any entanglement monotone. Furthermore, we extend the convex roof formulas to the phase-permutation invariant states as well.

Let $\mathcal{G}$ and $\mathcal{H}$ be subgroups of the local unitaries and $\mathcal{H} \subset \mathcal{G}$. The commutants of $\mathcal{G}$ and $\mathcal{H}$ satisfy $\mathcal{G}' \subset \mathcal{H}'$, so the family of $\mathcal{G}$-invariant states forms a subset of the $\mathcal{H}$-invariant states. If it is known how to compute the convex roofs of entanglement monotones on $\mathcal{G}$-invariant states, then we can apply the result of Theorem 8 to compute convex roofs on some $\mathcal{H}$-invariant states that are also in the convex hull of the orbit of some minimizing pure state. That is, we can evaluate the convex roofs of entanglement monotones on states that are in the intersection

$$\mathcal{T}_{\mathcal{H}}(\mathrm{D}) \cap \mathrm{co}\left(\mathrm{orb}_{\mathcal{G}}(\psi)\right)$$

if $|\psi\rangle$ is a minimizing pure state for a $\mathcal{G}$-invariant state, where $\mathrm{orb}_{\mathcal{G}}(\psi)$ is the orbit of $|\psi\rangle$ is denoted by

$$\mathrm{orb}_{\mathcal{G}}(\psi) = \{g|\psi\rangle\langle\psi|g^{-1} \,|\, g \in \mathcal{G}\}.$$

The minimizing pure states for Werner states are always the states $|\psi_a\rangle$ as defined in (17). We first show which of the phase-permutation Werner states $\rho^G_{\mathrm{wer}}(a,b)$ and OO-invariant states $\rho_{\mathrm{O}}(a,b)$ are in the orbits of these minimizing pure states. These are exactly the states depicted in regions A of Figures 1 and 2. This allows us to extend the formulas for convex roof entanglement monotones from the Werner states to this larger family of states. The proof of the following Lemma can be found in Appendix C.

Lemma 9. *Let $a \in [\frac{1}{2}, 1]$. Then*

1. $\rho_{\mathrm{wer}}(a,b) \in \mathrm{co}(\mathrm{orb}_{\mathrm{wer}}(\psi_a))$ *for all* $b \in [0, 1-a]$*; and*
2. $\rho_{\mathrm{O}}(a,b) \in \mathrm{co}(\mathrm{orb}_{\mathrm{wer}}(\psi_a))$ *for all* $b \in [0, \frac{2}{d}(1-a)]$.

That is, all states in region A *of Fig 1 and region* A *of Fig 2 are in the convex hulls of the orbits of the corresponding minimizing pure states for* $\rho_{\mathrm{wer}}(a)$.

A similar statement can be made for isotropic states. Here, however, the form of the Schmidt coefficients of the minimizing pure state $|\phi_b\rangle = \sum_{i=1}^d \sqrt{\lambda_i}|ii\rangle$ will depend on which entanglement monotone E is being considered. In most cases, the phase-permutation isotropic states $\rho^G_{\mathrm{wer}}(a,b)$ and OO-invariant states are in the orbits of these minimizing pure states are exactly the states depicted in regions B of Figures 1 and 3. The proof of the following Lemma can be found in Appendix C.

Lemma 10. *Let E be an entanglement monotone on pure states and let $b \in [\frac{1}{d}, 1]$. Let $|\phi_b\rangle = \sum_{i=1}^d \sqrt{\lambda_i}|ii\rangle$ be the pure state that minimizes E for $\rho_{\mathrm{iso}}(b)$.*

1. $\rho_{\mathrm{iso}}(a,b) \in \mathrm{co}(\mathrm{orb}_{\mathrm{wer}}(\phi_b))$ *for all* $a \in [0, 1-b]$.
2. *If $\boldsymbol{\lambda}$ is either of the form in* (24) *or* (29)*, then* $\rho_{\mathrm{O}}(a,b) \in \mathrm{co}(\mathrm{orb}_{\mathrm{iso}}(\phi_b))$ *for all* $a \in [0, \frac{d(1-b)}{2(d-1)}]$.

That is, all states in region B *of Fig 1 and region* B *of Fig 3 are in the convex hulls of the orbits of the corresponding minimizing pure states for* $\rho_{\mathrm{iso}}(b)$.

For every entanglement monotone considered in this work, the Schmidt coefficients of the minimizing pure states have this desired form. This allows us to extend the convex roofs of these entanglement monotones from the isotropic states to this larger family of states.

If $E_{\mathrm{wer}}(a)$ and $E_{\mathrm{iso}}(b)$ are already convex as functions of a and b, then Lemmas 9 and 10, together with Theorem 8, allow us to extend these convex roof formulas to any state in regions A of Fig 1 and Fig 2 and regions B of Fig 1 and Fig 3. It is noteworthy that the value of the convex roof for any entanglement monotone for these states depends only on one of the expectations $\mathrm{Tr}[\rho W_{\perp}]$ or $\mathrm{Tr}[\rho\Phi_d]$. As an example, the convex roofs of the Vidal monotones on the OO-invariant states with dimension $d = 5$ are shown in Fig 6.

If $E_{\mathrm{wer}}(a)$ and $E_{\mathrm{iso}}(b)$ are not convex, e.g. if there is some value b so that $\widehat{E_{\mathrm{iso}}}(b) < E_{\mathrm{iso}}(b)$, then we may still extend the formula to all of these states as long as E is continuous.

IV. CONVERSION WITNESSES

It was shown in [20] that a pure state $|\psi\rangle \in \mathbb{C}^d \otimes \mathbb{C}^d$ can be converted into an arbitrary mixed state $\rho \in \mathrm{D}(\mathbb{C}^d \otimes \mathbb{C}^d)$ if and only if there exists an pure state decomposition $\{p_i, |\varphi_i\rangle\}$ of ρ that satisfies

$$E_k(\psi) \geq \sum_i p_i E_k(\varphi_i)$$



FIG. 6. Convex roofs of the Vidal monotones E_k (for $d = 5$ and $k = 1, 2, 3, 4$) evaluated on regions A and B of the *OO*-invariant states.

for all positive integers k, where $\rho = \sum_i p_i |\varphi_i\rangle\langle\varphi_i|$. This necessary and sufficient condition for LOCC transformation can be encoded into the following complete witness:

$$W(\psi, \rho) = \max_{\{p_i, |\varphi_i\rangle\}} \min_k \left(E_k(\psi) - \sum_i p_i E_k(\varphi_i) \right), \quad (38)$$

where the maximum is taken over all pure state decompositions $\rho = \sum_i p_i |\varphi_i\rangle\langle\varphi_i|$. The function W is a complete witness in the sense that $W(\psi, \rho) \geq 0$ if and only if $|\psi\rangle$ can be converted into ρ via LOCC. Although this function cannot be computed for arbitrary mixed states, it can be simplified for certain classes of mixed states ρ. In particular, we compute $W(\psi, \rho)$ explicitly in the case when ρ is a state on $\mathbb{C}^2 \otimes \mathbb{C}^d$ for any d (i.e. in the case when at least one subsystem is a qubit). We can also make extensive use of symmetry to compute $W(\psi, \rho)$ in the case when ρ is highly symmetric (i.e. Werner or isotropic states).

The witness in (38) simplifies to a known necessary and sufficient condition for converting a pure state $|\psi\rangle$ to a mixed state ρ in the case when ρ is a state of a system in which one subsystem is a qubit [31]. Indeed, for pure states $|\varphi\rangle \in \mathbb{C}^2 \otimes \mathbb{C}^d$ with any $d \geq 2$, it holds that $E_k(\varphi) = 0$ whenever $k \geq 2$ since $|\varphi\rangle$ can have at most two nonzero Schmidt coefficients. If ρ is any mixed state on $\mathbb{C}^2 \otimes \mathbb{C}^d$, then the minimization over k in (38) can be eliminated, since only E_1 can be nonzero. In this case, the conversion witness in (38) simplifies to $W(\psi, \rho) = E_1(\psi) - \widehat{E_1}(\rho)$. This implies the following theorem.

Theorem 11. *For any bipartite mixed state ρ on $\mathbb{C}^2 \otimes \mathbb{C}^d$ and for any bipartite pure state $|\psi\rangle$ of systems of any size, it holds that $|\psi\rangle \xrightarrow{\text{LOCC}} \rho$ if and only if $E_1(\psi) \geq \widehat{E_1}(\rho)$.*

Furthermore, it was shown in [31] that $\widehat{E_1}$ for an arbitrary mixed state of two qubits simplifies to

$$\widehat{E_1}(\rho) = \frac{1 - \sqrt{1 - C(\rho)^2}}{2},$$

where $C(\rho)$ is the concurrence [2] of ρ. Hence, a pure state $|\psi\rangle$ can be converted into a mixed state ρ on $\mathbb{C}^2 \otimes \mathbb{C}^2$ if and only if $C(\psi) \geq C(\rho)$.

As the following theorem shows, the value of $\widehat{E_1}$ gives a necessary and sufficient condition for converting any pure states into Werner states of arbitrary dimension as well.

Theorem 12. *For any bipartite pure state $|\psi\rangle$ and any $a \in [0, 1]$, it holds that $|\psi\rangle \xrightarrow{\text{LOCC}} \rho_{\text{wer}}(a)$ if and only if $\lambda_1 \leq \frac{1}{2} + \sqrt{a(1-a)}$, where λ_1 is the largest Schmidt coefficient of $|\psi\rangle$.*

Proof. If $a \in [0, \frac{1}{2}]$ then $\rho_{\text{wer}}(a)$ is separable and the statement is trivial, so suppose that $a > \frac{1}{2}$. First suppose that $|\psi\rangle \xrightarrow{\text{LOCC}} \rho_{\text{wer}}(a)$. Then it must be the case that $E_1(\psi) \geq \widehat{E_1}(\rho_{\text{wer}}(a))$ since E_1 is an entanglement monotone. The result follows, since $E_1(\psi) = 1 - \lambda_1$ and $\widehat{E_1}(\rho_{\text{wer}}(a)) = \frac{1}{2} - \sqrt{a(1-a)}$. On the other hand, if $\lambda_1 \leq \frac{1}{2} + \sqrt{a(1-a)}$ then $\boldsymbol{\lambda} \prec \boldsymbol{\lambda}^a$, where $\boldsymbol{\lambda}$ is the vector of Schmidt coefficients of $|\psi\rangle$ and $\boldsymbol{\lambda}^a$ is the vector of Schmidt coefficients of $|\psi_a\rangle$ given in (17). It follows that $|\psi\rangle$ can be converted into $|\psi_a\rangle$ by LOCC. But $|\psi_a\rangle$ can be converted into $\rho_{\text{wer}}(a)$ via LOCC, since $\mathcal{T}_{\text{wer}}(|\psi_a\rangle\langle\psi_a|) = \rho_{\text{wer}}(a)$ and the twirling operation $\mathcal{T}_{\text{wer}}$ is LOCC. This concludes the proof. □

We have shown that the conversion witness in (38) can be computed explicitly in the cases when ρ is a Werner state or any state on a $\mathbb{C}^2 \otimes \mathbb{C}^d$ system, but it remains unknown if it can be computed explicitly for any other classes of states. However, it may still be useful to consider upper and lower bounds of this quantity, since these would give either necessary or sufficient conditions for LOCC conversion from $|\psi\rangle$ into ρ. In particular, in the case when $\rho = \rho_{\text{iso}}(b)$ is an isotropic state, a lower bound for (38) can be found. The following Theorem gives a no-go conversion witness for detecting when pure states cannot be converted into isotropic states.

Theorem 13. *Let $|\psi\rangle$ be a pure state and $b \in [\frac{1}{d}, 1]$. If $|\psi\rangle \xrightarrow{\text{LOCC}} \rho_{\text{iso}}(b)$ then $W_{\text{iso}}(\boldsymbol{\lambda}, b) \geq 0$, where*

$$W_{\text{iso}}(\boldsymbol{\lambda}, b) = \max_{\boldsymbol{\mu}} \min_k \big(E_k(\boldsymbol{\lambda}) - E_k(\boldsymbol{\mu}) \big) \quad (39)$$

and the the maximum is taken over all Schmidt vectors $\boldsymbol{\mu}$ that satisfy $\sum_i \sqrt{\mu_i} = \sqrt{db}$.

Proof. In the case when $\rho = \rho_{\text{iso}}(b)$, it is clear that a lower bound for the witness W in (38) can be given by

$$W(\psi, \rho_{\text{iso}}(b)) \geq \max_{|\varphi\rangle} \min_k \big(E_k(\psi) - E_k(\varphi) \big), \quad (40)$$



FIG. 7. An example of the witness in (39) with $d = 3$ and $\boldsymbol{\lambda} = (\frac{6}{10}, \frac{3}{10}, \frac{1}{10})$.

where the maximum is taken over all $|\varphi\rangle \in \mathbb{C}^d \otimes \mathbb{C}^d$ such that $\langle\varphi|\Phi_d|\varphi\rangle = b$. The left-hand side of the inequality in (40) can be further simplified to the desired expression in (39). □

In particular, if $W_{\rm iso}(\psi, b) < 0$ then $|\psi\rangle \xrightarrow{\text{LOCC}} \rho_{\rm iso}(b)$. Although the formula for this witness is now much simpler than the general one in (38), it still cannot be computed analytically for arbitrary Schmidt vectors $\boldsymbol{\lambda}$. However, we present a way to numerically compute these witnesses efficiently in Appendix D. An example of the witness in (39) with $d = 3$ and $\boldsymbol{\lambda} = (\frac{6}{10}, \frac{3}{10}, \frac{1}{10})$ is shown in Fig 7.

V. CONCLUSION

We computed the convex roof of entanglement monotones on certain classes of symmetric states. This generalized the work of [13] and [14], where the entanglement of formation was computed for Werner and isotropic states. In particular, we computed the convex roof for any entanglement monotone on Werner states. The convex roof of certain types of monotones was also computed on isotropic states. We were able to extend these formula for the convex roofs to many non-symmetric states as well. In particular, for many states with other types of symmetries (i.e., for OO-invariant states as well as phase-permutation Werner and isotropic type states), we were also able to compute the convex roofs of these monotones.

We also constructed a necessary and sufficient condition in the form of a conversion witness that determines when a bipartite pure state can be converted to any Werner state by LOCC. A similar conversion witness is constructed for detecting when a pure state can be converted into an isotropic state, but the condition is only necessary and not sufficient.

This work sheds light on the structure of bipartite entanglement of symmetric states, an area of research that is still quite active. Recently, work has been done on computing convex roofs of certain entanglement monotones on larger classes of symmetric states [32]. Investigations into further types of symmetries and other entanglement monotones will prove fruitful in the complete characterization of the LOCC convertibility of bipartite quantum entanglement.

Acknowledgements

The authors are grateful for fruitful discussions with Gael Sentís and Jens Siewert that took place during the workshop on multipartite entanglement at the Centro de Ciencias de Benasque Pedro Pascual in May 2016.

M.G. is supported by Alberta Innovates–Technology Futures (AITF) and the Killam Trusts.

[1] V. Vedral, M. B. Plenio, M. A. Rippin, and P. L. Knight. Quantifying entanglement, Physical Review Letters **78**, 2275 (1997), arXiv:quant-ph/9702027.
[2] W. K. Wootters. Quantum entanglement as a quantifiable resource, Philosophical Transactions of the Royal Society A: Mathematical, Physical and Engineering Sciences **356**, 1717 (1998).
[3] S. Ishizaka and M. B. Plenio. Multiparticle entanglement manipulation under positive partial transpose preserving operations, Physical Review A **71**, 052303 (2005), arXiv:quant-ph/0412193.
[4] M. B. Plenio and S. Virmani. An introduction to entanglement measures, Quantum Information & Computation **7**, 1 (2007), arXiv:quant-ph/0504163.
[5] M. B. Plenio and S. S. Virmani, in *Quantum Information and Coherence*, edited by E. Andersson and P. Öhberg (Springer International Publishing, 2014) pp. 173–209.
[6] R. Horodecki, P. Horodecki, M. Horodecki, and K. Horodecki. Quantum entanglement, Reviews of Modern Physics **81**, 865 (2009), arXiv:quant-ph/0702225.
[7] M. A. Nielsen. Conditions for a Class of Entanglement Transformations, Physical Review Letters **83**, 436 (1999).
[8] M. W. Girard and G. Gour. Computable entanglement conversion witness that is better than the negativity, New Journal of Physics **17**, 093013 (2015), arXiv:1410.7094.
[9] G. Vidal. Entanglement of Pure States for a Single Copy, Physical Review Letters **83**, 1046 (1999), arXiv:quant-ph/9902033.
[10] A. Uhlmann. Roofs and Convexity, Entropy **12**, 1799 (2010), arXiv:1108.3218v1.
[11] O. Bucicovschi and I. Lebl. On the continuity and regularity of convex extensions, Journal of Convex Analysis **20**, 1113 (2013), arXiv:1012.5796v3.
[12] D. P. DiVincenzo, P. W. Shor, J. A. Smolin, B. M. Terhal, and A. V. Thapliyal. Evidence for bound entangled states with negative partial transpose, Physical Review A **61**, 062312 (2000).
[13] K. G. H. Vollbrecht and R. F. Werner. Entanglement

measures under symmetry, Physical Review A **64**, 062307 (2001), arXiv:quant-ph/0010095.
[14] B. M. Terhal and K. G. H. Vollbrecht. Entanglement of Formation for Isotropic States, Physical Review Letters **85**, 2625 (2000), arXiv:quant-ph/0005062.
[15] G. Gour. Family of concurrence monotones and its applications, Physical Review A **71**, 012318 (2005), arXiv:quant-ph/0410148.
[16] C. Eltschka, G. Tóth, and J. Siewert. Partial transposition as a direct link between concurrence and negativity, Physical Review A **91**, 032327 (2015), arXiv:1505.01833.
[17] G. Sentís, C. Eltschka, O. Gühne, M. Huber, and J. Siewert. Quantifying entanglement of maximal dimension in bipartite mixed states, , 1 (2016), arXiv:1605.09783.
[18] G. Gour. Infinite number of conditions for local mixed-state manipulations, Physical Review A **72**, 022323 (2005), arXiv:quant-ph/0504095.
[19] G. Gour and S. Friedland. The minimum entropy output of a quantum channel is locally additive, IEEE Transactions on Information Theory **59**, 603 (2013), arXiv:1105.6122.
[20] V. Gheorghiu and R. Griffiths. Separable operations on pure states, Physical Review A **78**, 020304 (2008), arXiv:0807.2360.
[21] R. F. Werner. Quantum states with Einstein-Podolsky-Rosen correlations admitting a hidden-variable model, Physical Review A **40**, 4277 (1989).
[22] M. Horodecki and P. Horodecki. Reduction criterion of separability and limits for a class of distillation protocols, Physical Review A **59**, 4206 (1999), arXiv:quant-ph/9708015.
[23] J. Watrous, *Theory of Quantum Information* (2016).
[24] K. Audenaert, B. De Moor, K. G. H. Vollbrecht, and R. F. Werner. Asymptotic relative entropy of entanglement for orthogonally invariant states, Physical Review A **66**, 032310 (2002), arXiv:quant-ph/0204143.
[25] M. W. Girard, G. Gour, and S. Friedland. On convex optimization problems in quantum information theory, Journal of Physics A: Mathematical and Theoretical **47**, 505302 (2014), arXiv:arXiv:1402.0034v1.
[26] C. Eltschka and J. Siewert. Negativity as an Estimator of Entanglement Dimension, Physical Review Letters **111**, 100503 (2013), arXiv:arXiv:1304.7225v1.
[27] C. H. Bennett, D. DiVincenzo, J. Smolin, and W. Wootters. Mixed-state entanglement and quantum error correction, Physical Review A **54**, 3824 (1996), arXiv:quant-ph/9604024.
[28] M. B. Hastings, I. González, A. B. Kallin, and R. G. Melko. Measuring renyi entanglement entropy in quantum Monte Carlo simulations, Physical Review Letters **104**, 2 (2010), arXiv:1001.2335.
[29] D. W. Berry and B. C. Sanders. Bounds on general entropy measures, Journal of Physics A: Mathematical and General **36**, 12255 (2003), arXiv:arXiv:quant-ph/0305059.
[30] A. W. Marshall and I. Olkin, *Inequalities: theory of majorization and its applications*, edited by R. Bellman, Mathematics in Science and Engineering, Vol. 143 (Academic Press, New York, 1979).
[31] G. Vidal. Optimal local preparation of an arbitrary mixed state of two qubits: Closed expression for the single-copy case, Physical Review A - Atomic, Molecular, and Optical Physics **62**, 062315 (2000), arXiv:quant-ph/0003002.
[32] G. Sentís, C. Eltschka, and J. Siewert. Quantitative bound entanglement in two-qutrit states, Physical Review A **94**, 020302 (2016), arXiv:1609.01698.

Appendix A: Convex roof of entanglement monotones for Werner states

In this section, we present the proof of Theorem 3, which follows the ideas for computing the entanglement of formation for Werner states as presented in [13].

Proof (of theorem 3). If $a \in [0, \frac{1}{2}]$ then $E(\psi_a) = 0$ since $|\psi_a\rangle$ is separable, so the conclusion is trivially true. Suppose that $a \in [\frac{1}{2}, 1]$ and let $|\psi\rangle$ be another pure state satisfying $\langle\psi|W_-|\psi\rangle = a$. Let $\boldsymbol{\lambda}, \boldsymbol{\lambda}^a \in \mathbb{R}^d$ denote the Schmidt vectors of $|\psi\rangle$ and $|\psi_a\rangle$ respectively. We will show that $\boldsymbol{\lambda} \prec \boldsymbol{\lambda}^a$. Since

$$\boldsymbol{\lambda}^a = \left(\tfrac{1}{2} + \sqrt{a(1-a)}, \tfrac{1}{2} - \sqrt{a(1-a)}, 0, \ldots, 0\right)$$

has only two nonzero elements, it will suffice to show that $\max(\boldsymbol{\lambda}) \leq \frac{1}{2} + \sqrt{a(1-a)}$.

Without loss of generality we may suppose that $|\psi\rangle$ is of the form

$$|\psi\rangle = U \otimes I \sum_{i=1}^{d} \sqrt{\lambda_i}\, |ii\rangle \tag{A1}$$

for some unitary operator U. Then

$$\begin{aligned} a = \langle\psi|W_-|\psi\rangle &= \frac{1}{2}\left(1 - \sum_{i,j=1}^{d} \sqrt{\lambda_i\lambda_j}\langle i|U|j\rangle\langle i|U^*|j\rangle\right) \\ &= \frac{1}{2}\left(1 - \sum_{i,j=1}^{d} \sqrt{\lambda_i\lambda_j} U_{ij}\overline{U}_{ji}\right) \\ &= \frac{1}{4}\sum_{i,j=1}^{d} \left|\sqrt{\lambda_i}U_{ij} - \sqrt{\lambda_j}U_{ji}\right|^2, \end{aligned}$$

where $U_{ij} = \langle i|U|j\rangle$ are the matrix elements of U. Since U is unitary, it holds that $\sum_j |U_{ij}|^2 = 1$ for each i and thus $\sum_{i,j} \lambda_i |U_{ij}|^2 = 1$. For each $i, j \in \{1, \ldots, d\}$, define the probabilities

$$p_{ij} = \frac{\lambda_i |U_{ij}|^2 + \lambda_j |U_{ji}|^2}{2}$$

such that $p_{ij} \geq 0$ and $\sum_{i,j} p_{ij} = 1$. Note that $p_{ij} = p_{ji}$. For all i and j such that $p_{ij} \neq 0$, define the quantities

$$z_{ij} = \frac{\sqrt{\lambda_i}U_{ij}}{\sqrt{\lambda_i |U_{ij}|^2 + \lambda_j |U_{ji}|^2}} \qquad a_{ij} = \frac{|z_{ij} - z_{ji}|^2}{2}$$

such that $|z_{ij}|^2 + |z_{ji}|^2 = 1$ and $a_{ij} \in [0, 1]$. Define the Schmidt vectors

$$\boldsymbol{\mu}^{(ij)} = |z_{ij}|^2 \mathbf{e}_i + |z_{ji}|^2 \mathbf{e}_j$$

where $\{\mathbf{e}_1, \ldots, \mathbf{e}_d\}$ are the standard basis vectors of $\mathbb{R}^d$. It follows that

$$\sum_{i,j=1}^{d} p_{ij} a_{ij} = a \qquad \text{and} \qquad \sum_{i,j=1}^{d} p_{ij} \boldsymbol{\mu}^{(ij)} = \boldsymbol{\lambda}.$$

That is, the quantity a and the Schmidt vector $\boldsymbol{\lambda}$ can be written as convex combinations of quantities $a_{ij} \in [0,1]$ and Schmidt vectors $\boldsymbol{\mu}^{(ij)}$ using the same weights p_{ij}. Since $|z_{ij}|^2 + |z_{ji}|^2 = 1$ and $\left||z_{ij}|^2 - |z_{ji}|^2\right| \leq \left|{z_{ij}}^2 - {z_{ji}}^2\right|$, we see that

$$\begin{aligned} 2\max(\boldsymbol{\mu}^{(ij)}) &= 2\max\{|z_{ij}|^2, |z_{ji}|^2\} \\ &= |z_{ij}|^2 + |z_{ji}|^2 + \left||z_{ij}|^2 - |z_{ji}|^2\right| \\ &\leq 1 + \left|{z_{ij}}^2 - {z_{ji}}^2\right| \\ &= 1 + |z_{ij} - z_{ji}|\,|z_{ij} + z_{ji}|\,. \end{aligned} \tag{A2}$$

Furthermore note that $1 - a_{ij} = \frac{1}{2}|z_{ij} + z_{ji}|^2$, and thus

$$|z_{ij} - z_{ji}|\,|z_{ij} + z_{ji}| = 2\sqrt{a_{ij}(1 - a_{ij})}.$$

From (A2) it follows that $\max(\boldsymbol{\mu}^{(ij)}) \leq \frac{1}{2} + \sqrt{a_{ij}(1-a_{ij})}$. Since max is a convex function on $\mathbb{R}^d$, it follows that

$$\begin{aligned} \max(\boldsymbol{\lambda}) &= \max\left(\sum_{i,j=1}^{d} p_{ij} \boldsymbol{\mu}^{(ij)}\right) \\ &\leq \sum_{i,j=1}^{d} p_{ij} \max(\boldsymbol{\mu}^{(ij)}) \\ &\leq \sum_{i,j=1}^{d} p_{ij} \left(\tfrac{1}{2} + \sqrt{a_{ij}(1-a_{ij})}\right) \\ &\leq \tfrac{1}{2} + \sqrt{a(1-a)}, \end{aligned} \tag{A3}$$

where the final inequality in (A3) follows from the concavity of the function $f(t) = \sqrt{t(1-t)}$. This yields the desired result that $\boldsymbol{\lambda} \prec \boldsymbol{\lambda}^a$.

By Nielsen's majorization theorem [7], it follows that $E(\psi) \geq E(\psi_a)$. □

Appendix B: Convex roof of Vidal monotones for isotropic states

In this section, we present the proof of Lemma 5 and supply the details for the proof of Theorem 6. The proof of Lemma 5 follows directly from the following Lemma.

Lemma 14. *Let $b \in [\frac{1}{d}, 1]$ and let $|\psi\rangle$ be a pure state with Schmidt vector $\boldsymbol{\lambda}$ satisfying $\langle\psi|\Phi_d|\psi\rangle = a$. There exists a pure state $|\psi'\rangle = \sum_i \sqrt{\lambda'_i}|ii\rangle$ such that*

$$\langle\psi'|\Phi_d|\psi'\rangle = \frac{1}{d}\Big(\sum_{i=1}^{d} \sqrt{\lambda'_i}\Big)^2 = a = \langle\psi|\Phi_d|\psi\rangle$$

and $\boldsymbol{\lambda}' \succ \boldsymbol{\lambda}$, where $\boldsymbol{\lambda}'$ is the Schmidt vector for $|\psi'\rangle$.

Proof. We may suppose without loss of generality that $|\psi\rangle$ is of the same form as in (A1). Thus

$$\begin{aligned} b = \langle\psi|\Phi_d|\psi\rangle &= \frac{1}{d}\Big|\sum_{i=1}^{d} \sqrt{\lambda_i} U_{ii}\Big|^2 \\ &\leq \frac{1}{d}\Big(\sum_{i=1}^{d} \sqrt{\lambda_i}\Big)^2, \end{aligned} \tag{B1}$$

where we note that $|U_{ii}| \leq 1$ for all i since U is unitary. If $\sum_i \sqrt{\lambda_i} = \sqrt{db}$ then we may set $\boldsymbol{\lambda}' = \boldsymbol{\lambda}$ and we are done. Suppose instead that the inequality in (B1) is strict. Define a continuous function $s\colon \mathbb{R}^d \to \mathbb{R}$

$$s(\boldsymbol{\lambda}) = \frac{1}{d}\Big(\sum_{i=1}^{d} \sqrt{\lambda_i}\Big)^2. \tag{B2}$$

We may suppose that the entries of $\boldsymbol{\lambda}$ are decreasing. For all $p \in [0,1]$ define the Schmidt vectors

$$\boldsymbol{\lambda}'(p) = (1-p)\boldsymbol{\lambda} + p(1, 0, \ldots, 0).$$

Note that $s(\boldsymbol{\lambda}'(p))$ is continuous and strictly decreasing as a function of p, and that

$$\frac{1}{d} = s(\boldsymbol{\lambda}'(1)) < b < s(\boldsymbol{\lambda}'(0)) = s(\boldsymbol{\lambda}).$$

By continuity of s, there exists a $p \in (0,1)$ such that $s(\boldsymbol{\lambda}'(p)) = b$. Finally we note that $\boldsymbol{\lambda}'(p) \succ \boldsymbol{\lambda}$ for all p, which concludes the proof. □

We now supply the proof of Lemma 5. For an entanglement monotone E, recall that E_{iso} is defined as

$$E_{\text{iso}}(b) = \min\big\{E(\boldsymbol{\psi}) \,\big|\, \langle\psi|\Phi_d|\psi\rangle = b\big\}.$$

Proof (of Lemma 5). First consider the case $b \in [\frac{1}{d}, 1]$. For all pure states $|\psi\rangle$ satisfying $\langle\psi|\Phi_d|\psi\rangle = a$, from Lemma 14 we can find a pure state $|\psi'\rangle$ with Schmidt coefficients $\boldsymbol{\lambda}'$ satisfying $\langle\psi'|\Phi_d|\psi'\rangle = s(\boldsymbol{\lambda}') = a$ with $\boldsymbol{\lambda} \prec \boldsymbol{\lambda}'$. It follows that $E(\boldsymbol{\lambda}') = E(\psi') \leq E(\psi)$. Hence we may restrict the minimization in (22) to states of the form $|\psi\rangle = \sum_i \sqrt{\lambda_i}|ii\rangle$. This implies that the computation of $E_{\text{iso}}(b)$ may be simplified to

$$\begin{aligned} E_{\text{iso}}(b) &= \min\Big\{E(\boldsymbol{\psi}) \,\Big|\, |\psi\rangle = \sum_{i=1}^{d} \sqrt{\lambda_i}|ii\rangle \text{ and } s(\boldsymbol{\lambda}) = a\Big\} \\ &= \min\Big\{E(\boldsymbol{\lambda}) \,\Big|\, \sum_{i=1}^{d} \sqrt{\lambda_i} = \sqrt{db}\Big\} \end{aligned}$$

as desired.

Lastly we consider the case when $b \in [0, \frac{1}{d}]$. Consider the pure state

$$|\psi\rangle = \sqrt{db}\,|11\rangle + \sqrt{1-db}\,|12\rangle.$$

Then $\langle\psi|\Phi_d|\psi\rangle = b$, but $E(\psi) = 0$ since $|\psi\rangle$ is separable. It follows that $E_{\text{iso}}(b) = 0$. This concludes the proof. □

We now proceed to compute the convex roof of the Vidal monotones for isotropic states. The following lemma shows that E_k vanishes on the isotropic states with $b \in [0, \frac{k}{d}]$.

Lemma 15. *For any integer $1 \leq k \leq d$, it holds that $E_{k,\mathrm{iso}}(b) = 0$ for all $b \in [0, \frac{k}{d}]$.*

Proof. Since E_k is an entanglement monotone on pure states, the result of Lemma 5 shows that $E_{k,\mathrm{iso}}(b) = 0$ whenever $b \in [0, \frac{1}{d}]$. So we may suppose that $k \geq 2$ and $b \in [\frac{1}{d}, \frac{k}{d}]$. Consider the function s defined in (B2) restricted to the subset of Schmidt vectors $\boldsymbol{\lambda}$ that have at most k nonzero entries. The function s achieves the values $\frac{1}{d}$ and $\frac{k}{d}$ on this restriction, since

$$s\big((1,0,\ldots,0)\big) = \tfrac{1}{d} \quad \text{and} \quad s\left(\left(\tfrac{1}{k},\ldots,\tfrac{1}{k},0,\ldots,0\right)\right) = \tfrac{k}{d}.$$

The subset of Schmidt vectors in $\mathbb{R}^d$ containing at most k nonzero elements is also connected. By continuity of s, for any intermediate value $b \in [\frac{1}{d}, \frac{k}{d})$ there exists a Schmidt vector $\boldsymbol{\lambda}$ with at most k nonzero entries satisfying $s(\boldsymbol{\lambda}) = b$. Since $E_k(\boldsymbol{\lambda}) = 0$ for all such $\boldsymbol{\lambda}$, it follows that $E_{k,\mathrm{iso}}(b) = 0$ whenever $\frac{1}{d} \leq b \leq \frac{k}{d}$. □

Theorem 16. *Let $k \geq 1$ be an integer. It holds that*

$$E_{k,\mathrm{iso}}(b) = \begin{cases} 0, & b \in [0, \frac{k}{d}] \\ \frac{1}{d}\Big(\sqrt{(1-b)k} - \sqrt{b(d-k)}\Big)^2, & b \in [\frac{k}{d}, 1]. \end{cases} \tag{B3}$$

Proof. It was shown in Lemma 15 that $E_{k,\mathrm{iso}}(b) = 0$ whenever $b \in [0, \frac{k}{d}]$, so it remains to compute $E_{k,\mathrm{iso}}(b)$ when $b \in [\frac{k}{d}, 1]$. Computing $E_{k,\mathrm{iso}}(b)$ may be restated as the following optimization problem:

$$\begin{aligned} &\text{maximize: } \lambda_1 + \cdots + \lambda_k \\ &\text{subject to: } \sum_{i=1}^d \lambda_i = 1 \text{ and } \sum_{i=1}^d \sqrt{\lambda_i} = \sqrt{db}. \end{aligned}$$

It is not difficult to see (by using Lagrange multipliers) that the optimal $\boldsymbol{\lambda}$ must be of the form

$$\boldsymbol{\lambda} = \big(\underbrace{t,\ldots,t}_{k}, \underbrace{\tfrac{1-kt}{d-k},\ldots,\tfrac{1-kt}{d-k}}_{d-k}\big) \tag{B4}$$

for some $t \in [\frac{1}{d}, \frac{1}{k}]$. For $\boldsymbol{\lambda}$ of this form, we see that

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{i=1}^d \sqrt{\lambda_i} &= \left(k\sqrt{t} + (d-k)\sqrt{\tfrac{1-kt}{d-k}}\right) \\ &= k\sqrt{(1-t)} + \sqrt{(d-k)(1-kt)}. \end{aligned}$$

For $b \in [\frac{k}{d}, 1]$, the largest positive value of t that satisfies $k\sqrt{(1-t)} + \sqrt{(d-k)(1-kt)} = \sqrt{db}$ is given by

$$t = \frac{1}{k} - \frac{1}{kd}\big(\sqrt{(1-b)k} - \sqrt{b(d-k)}\big)^2. \tag{B5}$$

For $\boldsymbol{\lambda}$ as given in (B4) with t as in (B5), it follows that

$$\begin{aligned} E_{k,\mathrm{iso}}(\boldsymbol{\lambda}) &= 1 - (\lambda_1 + \cdots + \lambda_k) \\ &= 1 - kt \\ &= \tfrac{1}{d}\big(\sqrt{(1-b)k} - \sqrt{b(d-k)}\big)^2, \end{aligned}$$

as desired. □

Appendix C: Convex roofs on further symmetric states

1. Proof of Lemma 9

Proof (of Lemma 9 part 1). By convexity, it suffices to check only the states on the boundary. That is, we check $\rho^G_{\mathrm{wer}}(a,b)$ with $b = 0$ and $b = 1-a$. In both cases, we will find a pure state $|\psi\rangle \in \mathrm{orb}_{\mathrm{wer}}(\psi_a)$ such that $\mathcal{T}^G_{\mathrm{wer}}(\psi) = \rho^G_{\mathrm{wer}}(a,b)$.

Note that $\langle\psi_a|Q|\psi_a\rangle = 0$. Thus $\mathcal{T}^G_{\mathrm{wer}}(\psi_a) = \rho^G_{\mathrm{wer}}(a,0)$ and thus $\rho^G_{\mathrm{wer}}(a,0) \in \mathrm{co}(\mathrm{orb}_{\mathrm{wer}}(\psi_a))$. For $\rho^G_{\mathrm{wer}}(a,1-a)$, consider the unitary block matrix

$$U = \begin{pmatrix} \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} & \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} & \\ \frac{i}{\sqrt{2}} & \frac{-i}{\sqrt{2}} & \\ & & \mathbb{1} \end{pmatrix} \tag{C1}$$

that acts non-trivially only on the space only on the span of $\{|1\rangle, |2\rangle\}$. Then

$$U \otimes U|\psi_a\rangle = \sqrt{\frac{1-a}{2}}(|11\rangle + |22\rangle) - i\sqrt{\frac{a}{2}}(|12\rangle - |21\rangle).$$

It holds that $\langle\psi_a|U^* \otimes U^* Q U \otimes U|\psi_a\rangle = 1 - a$ and thus $\mathcal{T}^G_{\mathrm{wer}}(U \otimes U\psi_a) = \rho^G_{\mathrm{wer}}(a, 1-a)$, which completes the proof. □

Proof (of Lemma 9 part 2). By convexity, it suffices to check only the states on the boundary, i.e. $\rho^G_{\mathrm{wer}}(a,b)$ with $b = 0$ and $b = \frac{2(1-a)}{d}$. In both cases, we will find a pure state $|\psi\rangle \in \mathrm{orb}_{\mathrm{wer}}(\psi_a)$ such that $\mathcal{T}_{\mathrm{O}}(\psi) = \rho^G_{\mathrm{O}}(a,b)$. Note that $\langle\psi_a|\Phi_d|\psi_a\rangle = 0$. Thus $\mathcal{T}^G_{\mathrm{O}}(\psi_a) = \rho_{\mathrm{O}}(a,0)$. With the same U in (C1), it holds that $\langle\psi_a|U^* \otimes U^* \Phi_d U \otimes U|\psi_a\rangle = \frac{2(1-a)}{d}$. This implies that $\mathcal{T}_{\mathrm{O}}(U \otimes U\psi_a) = \rho^G_{\mathrm{wer}}(a, \frac{2(1-a)}{d})$ which completes the proof. □

2. Proof of Lemma 10

Recall that, for any entanglement monotone E and any $b \in [\frac{1}{d}, 1]$, the pure state that minimizes (23) will be of the form

$$|\phi_b\rangle = \sum_{i=1}^d \sqrt{\lambda_i}|ii\rangle \tag{C2}$$

where the Schmidt coefficients satisfy $\sum_{i=1}^d \sqrt{\lambda} = \sqrt{db}$.

Proof (of Lemma 10 part 1). As above, it suffices to check only the states on the boundary. That is, we check $\rho^G_{\text{iso}}(a,b)$ with $a=0$ and $a=1-b$. In both cases, we will find a pure state $|\psi\rangle \in \text{orb}_{\text{iso}}(\phi_b)$ such that $\mathcal{T}^G_{\text{iso}}(\psi) = \rho^G_{\text{iso}}(a,b)$. Note that $\langle\phi|Q|\phi\rangle = 1$ and thus

$$\langle\phi|(Q-\Phi_d)|\phi\rangle = 1-b.$$

Hence $\mathcal{T}^G_{\text{iso}}(\phi) = \rho^G_{\text{iso}}(1-b,b)$ and thus $\rho^G_{\text{iso}}(1-b,b) \in \text{co}(\text{orb}_{\text{iso}}(\phi_b))$. For $\rho^G_{\text{iso}}(0,b)$, we use the discrete Fourier transform unitary matrix

$$U = \frac{1}{\sqrt{d}} \sum_{j,k=1}^{d} \omega^{jk} |j\rangle\langle k|,$$

where $\omega = e^{\frac{2i\pi}{d}}$ is the d^{th} root of unity. It holds that

$$\begin{aligned}\langle\phi_b|U\otimes\overline{U}QU^*\otimes\overline{U}^*|\phi_b\rangle &= \frac{1}{d^2}\sum_{k=1}^{d}\Big(\sum_{j=1}^{d}\sqrt{\lambda_j}\left|\omega^{jk}\right|^2\Big)^2 \\ &= \frac{1}{d}\Big(\sum_{j=1}^{d}\sqrt{\lambda_j}\Big)^2 \\ &= b.\end{aligned}$$

Thus $\langle\phi_b|U\otimes\overline{U}(Q-\Phi_d)U^*\otimes\overline{U}^*|\phi\rangle = 0$. This implies that $\mathcal{T}^G_{\text{iso}}(U\otimes\overline{U}|\phi\rangle) = \rho^G_{\text{iso}}(0,b)$, which completes the proof. □

Proof (of Lemma 10 part 2). It suffices to check only the states on the boundary. That is, we check $\rho^G_{\text{O}}(a,b)$ with $a=0$ and $a=\frac{d(1-b)}{2(d-1)}$. Note that $\langle\phi_b|W_-|\phi_b\rangle = 0$ and thus $\mathcal{T}_{\text{O}}(\phi_b) = \rho_{\text{O}}(0,b)$. Hence $\rho_{\text{O}}(0,b) \in \text{co}(\text{orb}_{\text{iso}}(\phi_b))$. For $\rho_{\text{O}}(\frac{d(1-b)}{2(d-1)},b)$, it suffices to find a unitary U such that

$$\langle\phi_b|(U\otimes\overline{U})^*W_-(U\otimes\overline{U})|\phi_b\rangle \geq \frac{d(1-b)}{2(d-1)}.$$

We split the proof into two parts. First suppose that $\boldsymbol{\lambda}$ is of the form

$$\boldsymbol{\lambda} = \big(t,\ldots,t,\tfrac{1-kt}{d-k},\ldots,\tfrac{1-kt}{d-k}\big)$$

with $|\phi_b\rangle = \sum_{i=1}^{d}\sqrt{\lambda_i}|ii\rangle$ and

$$\Big(\sum_{i=1}^{d}\sqrt{\lambda_i}\Big)^2 = \big(k\sqrt{t}+\sqrt{(d-k)(1-kt)}\big)^2 = db.$$

For distinct indices $j,k \in \{1,2,\ldots,d\}$ with $j<k$, define the unitary matrices

$$U_{j,k} = \sum_{l\neq j,k}|l\rangle\langle l| + \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}\big(|j\rangle\langle j| + |j\rangle\langle k| + i|k\rangle\langle j| - i|k\rangle\langle k|\big)$$

that act non-trivially only on the subspace spanned by $\{|j\rangle,|k\rangle\}$ and trivially elsewhere. Note that U in (C1) is $U_{1,2}$ in this notation. Furthermore note that

$$\langle\phi_b|(U_{j,k}\otimes\overline{U_{j,k}})^*W_-(U_{j,k}\otimes\overline{U_{j,k}})|\phi_b\rangle = \frac{\big(\sqrt{\lambda_j}-\sqrt{\lambda_k}\big)^2}{2}.$$

Let $U = (U_{1,d})(U_{2,d-1})\cdots(U_{m,d+1-m})$ where $m = \min\{k,d-k\}$. Then

$$\begin{aligned}&\langle\phi_b|(U\otimes\overline{U})^*W_-(U\otimes\overline{U})|\phi_b\rangle \\ &\quad= \frac{(\sqrt{\lambda_1}-\sqrt{\lambda_d})^2}{2}+\cdots+\frac{(\sqrt{\lambda_m}-\sqrt{\lambda_{d-m+1}})^2}{2} \\ &\quad= \frac{m}{2(d-k)}\Big(\sqrt{(d-k)t}-\sqrt{1-kt}\Big)^2 \\ &\quad= \frac{m}{2(d-k)}\left(\frac{d(1-b)}{k}\right) \\ &\quad= \frac{d(1-b)}{2}\frac{\min\{k,d-k\}}{k(d-k)} \\ &\quad\geq \frac{d(1-b)}{2}\frac{1}{d-1}\end{aligned}$$

with equality if and only if $k=d-1$ or $k=1$ (or $b=1$). The result follows.

The proof of the other case is analogous. In this case, suppose that $\boldsymbol{\lambda}$ is of the form

$$\boldsymbol{\lambda} = \big(t,\ldots,t,1-kt,0,\ldots,0\big)$$

with $(\sum_{i=1}^{d}\sqrt{\lambda_i})^2 = (k\sqrt{t}+\sqrt{1-kt})^2 = db$. Using the unitary $U = (U_{1,d})(U_{2,d-1})\cdots(U_{\lfloor\frac{d}{2}\rfloor,d-\lfloor\frac{d}{2}\rfloor+1})$, it is not difficult to show that

$$\langle\phi_b|(U\otimes\overline{U})^*W_-(U\otimes\overline{U})|\phi_b\rangle \geq \frac{d(1-b)}{2(d-1)}$$

with equality if and only if $k=d-1$ (or $b=1$). □

Appendix D: Pure to isotropic conversion witness

For a fixed Schmidt vector $\boldsymbol{\lambda}$ we define

$$f_k(\boldsymbol{\mu}) = E_k(\boldsymbol{\lambda}) - E_k(\boldsymbol{\mu}),$$

and write this as $f_k(\boldsymbol{\mu}) = \mu_1+\cdots+\mu_k-(\lambda_1+\cdots+\lambda_k)$. The goal is to compute

$$W_{\text{iso}}(\boldsymbol{\lambda},\boldsymbol{\mu}) = \max_{\boldsymbol{\mu}}\min_{k} f_k(\boldsymbol{\mu}).$$

We can split this into $d-1$ separate optimization problems as follows. For each $k\in\{1,\ldots,d-1\}$, we maximize $f_k(\boldsymbol{\mu})$ over all $\boldsymbol{\mu}$ for which k yields the minimum. That is, maximize over all $\boldsymbol{\mu}$ for which $f_k(\boldsymbol{\mu}) \leq f_\ell(\boldsymbol{\mu})$ for all $\ell\in\{1,\ldots,d-1\}$. Minimizing this over all k yields the desired result

$$W_{\text{iso}}(\boldsymbol{\lambda},\boldsymbol{\mu}) = \min_{k}\left[\max_{\boldsymbol{\mu}}\{f_k(\boldsymbol{\mu})|f_k(\boldsymbol{\mu})\leq f_\ell(\boldsymbol{\mu}) \text{ for all } \ell\}\right]$$

where the maximizations are taken over all Schmidt vectors satisfying $\sum_{i=1}^{d}\sqrt{\mu_i} = \sqrt{db}$.

For each k, these sub-optimization problems can be rewritten as follows:

$$\begin{aligned}
\text{maximize:} \quad & \sum_{i=1}^{k} \mu_i \\
\text{subject to:} \quad & \sum_{i=1}^{d} \mu_i = 1 \\
& \sum_{i=1}^{d} \sqrt{\mu_i} = \sqrt{db} \\
& \sum_{i=2}^{\ell} \mu_i \leq \sum_{i=2}^{\ell} \lambda_i \text{ for all } \ell \in \{1, \ldots, k-1\} \\
& \sum_{i=k+1}^{\ell+1} \lambda_i \leq \sum_{i=k+1}^{\ell+1} \mu_i \text{ for all } \ell \in \{k+1, \ldots, d-1\}.
\end{aligned}$$

There are d constraints for these d-dimensional optimization problems, so we may use the method of Lagrange multipliers to find optimal solutions.